FRIENDLY ADVICE TO THE CORRECTOUR OF THE English Press AT OXFORD

Concerning the

English Orthography.

LONDON,

Printed for *Robert Clavell* at the *Peacock* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard. 1682.

768.15

Friendly Advice to the Corrector of the Engliſh Preſs at OXFORD.

SIR,

AS dutiful and loving Children, who can patiently and wiſely behold the changes and decays of their aged Parents, (the common fate of all earthly things) can neither with patience nor ſilence ſee violent hands laid on them, haſtening them to ruine; no more could I, being naturally Engliſh, and a lover of Engliſh, without much trouble of mind, begetting at length this neceſſary Vindication, behold our Mother Tongue ſo preſumptuouſly handled by you, to her ruine, under colour of kindneſs to it.

I will not deny but you might, in theſe your attempts, have as honeſt an end, as had the daughters of *Pelias* towards him their aged Father; intending nothing worſe, than the renewing and advancing it; as if that were true of you alſo, which *Ovid* hath, of them, *Metam. l.* 4.

In manibus veſtris vita eſt, ætáſque parentũ.

and the life and flouriſhing of our Language depended wholly on your Art, your Mercy, and Juſtice. Though I confeſs, in one of the *London Gazets*, ſometime ſince printed, I find your, or ſome of the ſame Combination, to be ſo modeſt as to take great *London* into the Plot too, and offer it there to the world, as it is ſpoken, and (as I remember) written in *London* and *Oxford:* coupling *London* and *Oxford* together, as Duck and Mallard by the Bills: or as they are wont to joyn Rabbits together, a fat one, and a lean one, that the one may put off the other the better. And yet this pretty piece of arrogation contrived ſo neatly by the Factors of the Glory of *Oxford*, I find to have ſucceeded ſo unhappily already, that a late Comedian in his *Wits*, forbeareth not to cenſure ſuch Projectors, as ſuch *who take a pride in writing of falſe Engliſh:* whereas it was ſuppoſed and intended men ſhould believe it was true, becauſe they writ it ſo. And if you would know why *London* and *Oxford* muſt be the only Rule of writing and ſpeaking pure, reformed Engliſh, it is (as was intimated) that *Oxford* alone might give Law in this caſe, and *London* look on and admire that Univerſity, in compariſon of which, (as your publick Orator *D. S.* once ſolemnly ſaid) *Cambridge* was no better than a Country School. But if that had been all, ſomething had remained good to her; but now, of late, it is in danger to looſe that little reputation, as not being able to teach true Engliſh, for want of a Theatre.

But how great accrument of glory is due to you, for your late Emendations of our Language, I ſhall endeavour briefly to declare, if not prove, as well from ſome general Obſervations of other Languages, againſt which you offend; as alſo more particularly againſt the moſt certain conſtitution of our Engliſh Tongue. For I think, I may here cry out with *Druſius* in *Geneſis* firſt, v. 5. *O divina Grammatica, quam ſæpe ineptiunt qui te negligunt & contemnunt!* And ſo again, Deut. 26. 6. *O divina Criſis, quam multa ſæpe ignorant qui te ignorant! O divine Grammatical learning, how do they often trifle, who neglect and contemn thee? O heavenly Critical learning, how many things do not they know, who are ignorant of thee!*

I might begin from the Tower of *Babel* to ſhew what affronts you put upon the 75 Languages into which the once united Maſs of Tongues mouldred, as *Clemens Alexandrinus Stromat. p.* 338. noteth: but S. *Hierome* upon S. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, chap. 26. ſays into 72, according to the number of Nations diſtinguiſhed, over which (ſay the ſame Authors) ſo many Angels do preſide; to

which he ſuppoſed Chriſts words to relate, when he mentioned the 12 Legions of Angels ready to aſſiſt him at his call: But chiefly I forbear, becauſe I am, in truth, no ſuch Antiquarie, nor Linguiſt, as to be able to diſcourſe of them, and becauſe both Mr. *Selden de Synedriis*, *l.* 3. *c.* 9. *n.* 3. and *Buxtorf de Linguæ Hebrææ Origine*, *Theſ.* 10, 11, 12. have learnedly diſcourſed on that Subject. But if we will give any credit to *Goropius Becanus* in his *Hermathema*, or our own *Verſtegan*, we ſhall find that the *Saxon-Dutch* Language, (of which ours is a principal Dialect) is a Mother Tongue, and moſt ancient, and conſequently, ſo venerable, as to be valued for that, and to be ſerved by Moderner Tongues, and not, contrary to its *Genius*, to be modelled and corrected by ſome which inferiour in age, would pretend to be ſuperiour in perfection, whereas in truth, it is the moſt ſignificant in it ſelf, moſt elegant in its compoſitions, and conciſeſt of all Languages under Heaven; and therefore well might have ſerved our turn ſtill, without the corrupt mixtures (which ſome call Graces) of other Languages.

There is a common Fate which purſuing all ſublunary things to decay and confuſion, ſeizes on Tongues and Languages too, as *Horace*, *de Arte Poetica*, hath taught us, thus.

Ut Sylvæ foliis pronos mutantur in annos
Prima cadunt: ita verborum vetus interit ætas.
Et juvenum ritu florent modo nata vigentque
Debemur morti nos noſtraque——

And not only do the Languages vary ſo, as out of one common Root of Hebrew, (as moſt ſay) or Chaldee (as ſome think) the vaſt diverſity of words do riſe (though no doubt but many words after the diviſion of Tongues were by the ſeparated Societies of People invented, having no dependence at all upon the moſt Original Tongue) but diverſity of pronunciation alſo, of the ſame Language will prevail, and create ſubdiviſions thereof. The Oriental Tongues, as Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriack and Arabick, are generally Guttural in their ſpeech: but thoſe of *Aſia* the Leſs, with the *European* Greeks are moſt Palatine; uſing the palate of the mouth, in ſpeaking: as alſo do the Italian and Spanards, as *Hiſpalenſis Iſidore*, (himſelf a Spaniard) teſtifieth. Yet if he had lived in theſe days, his judgment might have been queſtion'd, ſhould he ſo ſpeak. For at this day, *Italy* alone differs much according to the principal Inſtruments of ſpeech. For the Florentines, now a days, are almoſt as much Guttural as the Arabians, or our Welſh. The Venetians uſe the Palate of their mouth moſt: The Neopolitans pronounce moſt from their teeth, and the Genoeſe in the lips: the Romans retaining the beſt *decorum* in pronunciation. All which I mention, not out of any vain pretence to Criticalneſs in thoſe Languages, but to draw from thence this concluſion directly appoſite to the very late humour ſtirring: For though theſe Tongues thus vary, none that I have heard of, (being eſpecially no better Judges than we by and by ſhall ſhew you to be) have preſumed to alter the Language in writing, as they have involuntarily in pronunciation: but this is a Spirit of Arrogance worthy of *Oxford* only.

But I doubt not you will waft me over into *France*, to learn new faſhions there, or bring them over to *England*, for grand Preſidents of mending Languages here: but I muſt crave leave to deny both the Authentickneſs of ſuch a Precedent, and the prudence of the writers after ſuch Copies: both becauſe it is a vain and phantaſtical Nation, light, and variable, and can never ſee when they are in a good condition; and becauſe the Ape is always more ridiculous in his imitations, than is he whoſe actions are ſo natural, (as daily change is to the French) as to become him well enough: and alſo becauſe I find that humour of theirs lately taken up, of writing as they ſpeak (which ſurely you aim at in ſome meaſure) condemned by one of their own Nation, when it ſcarce peeped out of its ſhell, a fitter judge of Language than they who advanced

that

that vain design. For of it thus writeth *Seigneur Des Accords*, in his *Bigarures*; or Collections Recreative, fol. 3. 'De nostre temps quelques un se 'sont volu efforcer de innover in l'escriture Francoise: l'autorite des quelles est 'trop petit, & les raisons trop foibles pour se fair croir. Et quand cela se pou- 'roit (se que je n'accorderay jamais) si est ce que pour instereit du poublick, il ne 'devoit souffrir. Car il adviendroit, que d'icy a cent ans, il ne ce trouvoit plus 'persones qui peut lire toutes nous escritures; ny protocoles de Notairs: & per 'un pernicieux consequence, feroit accroyer, quils auroient escrire de mots ou 'jamais n'avoient pense. Which I presume thus to English: *Every one now a days takes upon him to innovate our writing: whose Authority is too small, and their reasons too weak to give them credit. And if this should take effect, which I will never believe; if it were only for the publick interest, it were not to be endured. For it may happen hereby, that an hundered years hence, we should scarce find one, who should be able to read all our writings, no not the first draughts of our Registers: and so by pernicious consequence, men shall be made to believe, that they wrote such things as they never imagined.* And if it be said yet, That it becomes us to conform our Language nearer to transmarine compositions of words: I shall presume to tell you, I cannot agree to them in such counsels: and that upon the same reason *Scotus* gave, why water is cold, and fire hot, *quia hoc est hoc, & illud est illud*; i. e. *water is water, and fire is fire:* and French is French; and Italian is Italian; and English is English: and so let it be for me; whatever it may be for you.

But, methinks I hear that phanatical reason from you, used by Sectaries for the reforming our Religion, contrary to Law and Reason, *viz.* What needs so many superfluous letters cumber our words, and make our Language too hard and burdensome to many well meaning Subjects of his Majesty, who are willing to live in peace? And why should we be troubled with so many Letters which profit nothing, but hinder good people, who would gladly Write true English, but they cannot command their spirits to conforme to so many ceremonies of spelling? And therefore surely, it were far better for the better uniting his Majesties good Subjects in one plain and easie way of writing true English, to lay aside these dividing, inneceſſary formes of spelling words. And besides, all this, there was an excellent Act of Parliament drawn up by (then) Mr. *Birch*: in his Ingenious Catalogue of Books under the Rebellious Government, which, seems to be very necessary now; and put in practice in *Oxford*, without the consent of the King, or either House of Parliament, the Theatre giving authority enough to it: and it is this, as it there stands, Classis the Second, Act. 36. word for word. *An Act in behalf of all Clerks and Notaries, whereby they have libertie, to Shorten, dash, or contract any words, for avoiding of false English, as heretofore in Latine.* To this so great authority, (the best vindication of you) I confess I want an answer, unless I may say it hath been of late years, antiquated. And for your tender, scrupulous, and aggrieved spirits with the superfluous rites of spelling English, I leave you to be eased by the many, large, and elaborate Disputations published for the use of Weak Dissenters; such as I take you to be, as will competently appear from what now follows.

First that you seem not to have considered, your liberty of reforming, is repugnant to the general customes of all known Languages to me, and I believe to you also, though much more a Linguist than am I, as Dissenters demands are to all known Religions: For First, All Languages have ever allowed some Consonants and some vowels in words to stand idle, and *Quia sient* (as they speak) unlesse perhaps serving for *Euphonie*, or gracefullnes of pronunciation, or to direct us to the fountain from which they spring? And who, that hath but tasted of the Oriental Tongues, can be ignorant of *Sheva Quiescent* in the beginning, middle, and end of words very oft? but I do not mean as if

ever it began a word, but as the first syllable of a word. But this is one quarrel which you pick with the English tongue, that it hath *e* often, and sometime other letters, not sounded and therefore not to be suffered: denying it the common law or libertie of all languages, most unreasonably, and by consequence, unlearnedly: And thus you (for example) you also strike out *p* in the midle of a word at your pleasure; and contrarie to your own rule of conforming English to other Languages: and for *temptation*, you will have *temtation*; and for *redemption*, *redemtion*: that you may alienate them the farther from the Latine Tongue, from whence they spring: to which sometimes you would reconcile us.

Next, you shew your self a great enemie to our Englisn Dipthongs; in which our tongue exceeds most, if not all Languages; which you therefore judge as unbecoming it, as *Dionysius* the Tyrant did the golden beard of *Æsculapius*, which he sacrilegiously took away, because his Father *Apollo had* no beard at all: as *Tully* tells us *De natura deorum*. So surely very undecent do you esteem it, that we, (as Learned Mr. *Butler* in his English Grammar hath noted before me) should have eleven Dipthongs, and other Languages have not above half so many. For in truth I see no reason but we should allow 12 Dipthongs in our Tongue, and why *io* in words derived from the Latine Tongue, should not be so accounted. Examples of all which these may be: *ai*, as *faith*, *aid*, *maid*: *ea*, as *lead*, *read*, *fear*, *heaven*: *ie*, as *field*, *friend*, *liev*, signifying choice; as when we say *I had as liev*, and *I had liever*, which vulgarly is corrupted into, *I had lether*, or in stead of that, is used, *I had rather*, which is quite another word descended from the Saxon word *rath*, signifying, *soon*. But to proceed, *eo*, as *people*; *ei*, as *heir*, *their*, *eu*, *Feud*, *Eunuch*: *oa*, *Oak*, *choak*, *coast*: *ou*, *loud*, *south*, *thou*, and most, or all our words derived from Latine Substantives; as *Doctour*, *Amour*, *Ardour*: which it hath pleased you to change very arbitrarily into, *or*. In *oi*, *moist*, *soil*: *ui*, as *guilt*, *quilt*: *io*; as *mention*, *nation*, *vision*, where the four last letters make but one syllable pronounced in Prose, or Verse, unless when the Verse requires a *diæresis*, or seperation; as the Latines do; sometimes, writing *pictæi* for *pictæ*. The French Grammars tell us, that Tongue hath one Tripthongs as *beautè*, which also our Tongue hath, writing *beautie*.

Now when a Language is thus setled by consent, for private heads to break the Rule, under pretence of meliorating the same is to bring in confusion: and to make our writing as different as our pronunciation, which will be no small inconvenience, and is such a violence, void of prudence, that none of those we call the Learned Languages, would ever endure, though subject to the like discrepancie in speaking and writing as ours is: and no learned men, before this Age, (and it is well if they of this Age be learneder then other men) did ever attempt to reforme a Language in this manner: so that it may seem rather an emptie affectation to seem some bodie; than really to be so. But if that humour be prevalent in them, it were a great deal better they should remove their Press from *Oxford*, to *Smolensko*, or some noted Citie between the *Moscovites* and *Polacks*, whose Slavonian or Sarmatian Language is so crouded thick with consonants, which cannot all be heard, they seem extremely to need and call for such a *Procustes*, as *Oxford* hath; who may lengthen or shorten words, as they agree best with his Cratch. But the truth is, that a fundamental errour against the Analogy of all Tongues, hath mightily abused you, to conceive that Pronounciation should be any certain Rule of Orthographie, when as it self is very uncertain: and your reformations many of them do not answer the true pronunciation: so that I scarce know where to have you, in such inconstancies; who sometime would have pronuciation a Rule of spelling, and sometimes your (not the common) spelling a Rule of true pronunciation. But possibly you had before you for a Precedent, *Augustus Cesar*, (For surely you

must

must imagine your self above the condition of a subject, who undertake to give us Laws of writing and speaking our own tongue) of whom *Suetonius* in his Life writes, *Videtur potius eorum sequi opinionem qui perinde scribendum, ac loquendum existiment. He seemed to be of their opinion, who conceive we ought to write as we speake.* And therefore *Suetonius* himself (as it follows) wonders very much, at what others wrote of him, that he was such a severe and punctual observer of Orthographie, that *Legato Consulari successorem dederit, ut rudi & indocto, cujus manu Ixi, pro Ipsi scriptum animadvertit:* i. e. He turned a Deputy-Consul out of his Office, and put another into his room, because, under his own hand, he wrote *Ixi* for *Ipsi*, as an ignorant illiterate Fellow. From hence it may be most probably gathered, that, in those days, *Ixi* was vulgarly pronounced for *Ipsi*, and yet *Augustus*, (as well learned, as wise) would not suffer such emendations, upon such grounds. And the difficulty of reconciling *Augustus* his opposite practises, is not so great as it seemed to *Suetonius*. For either we are to understand the Emperour of Phrase, rather then Words or Orthographie, as if he avoided the finery or gallantry of Language, unbecoming the Majesty of so great a Prince, and chose to write plainly (but yet truly) as he spake; or else, he might look upon the correction of a Language, as a matter above the capacity of persons, who are as subject to the Laws of speaking, as they are of living, under their Sovereign *Tiberius Cesar*, desired and endeavoured to add but one Letter more to the Roman Alphabet, but common consent and custome would not allow it him: Brave, but certainly not grave spirits are they, who, at their private pleasures should ambitiously become the Authors of adding or taking away a letter from a word: as will appear now we come to a more particular examination of your alterations made in our Mother Tongue, in some few, of many instances to be given.

I confess I am not much versed in the English Prints at *Oxford*. I have only seen a Bible in *Quarto* there printed; but never read one Page in it, as being unwilling to read so sacred a Volumne, when I should be sure to meet with many errours, though but Grammatical. But I have been told by a principal Bookseller in *London*, that men would not buy that Impression, for your Heterodox spelling, found therein. I am better acquainted with two other Books printed at *Oxford*; the one named, *The Ladies Calling*, the other *The Government of the Tongue:* in which I do not pretend to instance in half the *Cacographies* there found, but such few as the entrance into them offers to every eye: And lest you should loose time in teaching us new words, the very first word, and that of the Preface, gives us a notable instance of your extraordinary faculty of diviſing words, never heard of before in our Language: where you say, *The Editor to the Reader*. And surely it was your modesty so to write; for had you said, *The Editor* to the *Lector*, it would have made a greater noise, and procured you greater admiration amongst women, to whom you write. And yet again you went so far, that if (as it often happens) bad Latine words make good English ones; the Ladies, to whom you write, might fear you had greater mind to eat them, than instruckt them. But if you had plased to have suffered it to smell of the English Tongue, so far as to have written *Editour*, a small glimse had been given to a good guesser, to know your meaning: but writing *Editor*, none unlearned above the English Tongue, can tell whether the word be Hebrew, Arabick, or Ethiopick, for it comes as near them as English. I dare say, never an English man in *London* ever spake or wrote such a word, though you once promised such a form of the English Tongue as was spoken in *London* and *Oxford*. I pray be pleased to turn to your Dr. *Heilin*'s Animadversions on that Ingenious and Learned Gentleman, Mr. *Hammond Lestrange* his History of King *Charles* the First, and not far from the beginning, you shall find a few Verses against such boisterous words, which will

fit

ſit your foot exactly: but I think not requiſite here to repeat them. But the truth is, that ever ſince Mr. *Holliday* ſet your ſtile at *Oxford*, a *Gog*, (who in his latter days both diſtaſted and deteſted his own ſtrains) you have but too commonly and juſtly deſerved the cenſure of *Auguſtus Ceſar*: of whom *Suetonius* in his Life, chap.86. thus writes; *M. Antonium quidem, ut inſanum increpat, quaſi ea ſcribentem, quæ mirentur potius homines, quam intelligant.* *He reproved* Mark Antony *as ſenſleſs, for ſo writing, as if he would have men rather admire, than underſtand him.* It may be, you will ſet *Tully* againſt *Auguſtus*, of whom *Quintilian*, or *Cornelius Tacitus*, or (as others lately think) *Meſſala de Claris Oratoribus*, thus writes, *Satis conſtat, nec Ciceroni quidem detractatores defuiſſe, quibus inflatus & tumens, nec ſatis preſſus, ſupra modum exultans, & ſuperfluens, & parum antiquus videretur.* 'Tis true, *Cicero* might ſeem to ſome detractours, flatuous, and ſwollen, and not ſufficiently compact, but flaunting, ſuperfluous, and modern: but we cannot ſay he deviſed new words, or, as great a Maſter of the Latine Tongue as he was, that he took upon him to add, and leave out Letters in writing, as he liſted: or that he ſtuffed every page with Metaphores, Hyperboles, Synecdoches, and ſuch like, as not to ſay according to the common Proverb, *A man cannot ſee wood for trees*, but a man cannot ſee trees for leaves: nor what ſtuff the garment is made of, for colours. But *Ariſtotle* in his Rhetorick gave us no ſuch advice, but on the contrary rather, that ornament of Speech ſhould be rather ἤ Νόμασι than ἐ Νόμασι: ſawce, than meat; but I ſee forrein Cookery is crept into the Engliſh Tongue, as well as ſet on our Tables: by vertue of which, we find in an egregious Sermon publiſhed by a bold Divine very near *Oxford*, to have dreſſed up luckie Treaſon, ſo handſomely, that it may make a man in love with it, and hate only the Oratour.

But I am not now to meddle with thoſe offences; but with the petty Treaſons of clipping the Kings Engliſh, and adulterating his Language; which ſober men were not wont to do formerly. Very few (I confeſs) are the corruptions you make inſtead of corrections, by additions, yet one I ſhall name in your *Government of the Tongue*, as *Sciencies* for *Sciences*, generally received; becauſe ſurely it was not neer enough the Latine Tongue before: and therefore, hereafter by the ſame reaſon we muſt alſo write *Inſtancies*, and *experiencies*, and *ignorancies*, for our uſual, *Inſtances*, *experiences*, and *ignorances*: Nay, we muſt go through the work of reforming, and in the ſingular number alſo, write *Sciencie* for *Science*, and *inſtancie* for *inſtance*, and *experiencie* for *experience*. For our Language (as I ſhall ſhew by and by) requires nothing more, generally to the making a Noun Subſtantive plural, of a ſingular, but the addition of a ſingle *s*.

Now I am to touch your alteration by way of defect: and firſt, in the middle of words, where firſt I note your great ſpite, or skill againſt Dipthongs, generally turning words derived from the Latine, into the Latine Tongue again: as *Editor*, (intended for an Engliſh word, but ſpoil'd in the making) for *Editour*; and writing *color* for *colour*; and *humor* for humour. And the vein being on you, you could not ſtop there, but venture to do the like to words properly Engliſh; as *Neighbor* for *Neighbour*; and *mold* for *mould*. And no better deal you with *ea*, dipthong; writing *leſur* for *leaſure*, and *meſur* for *meaſure*; contrary to the French, whom ſometimes you pretend to follow; who write *meaſure*, as we do. And what can be the reaſon hereof, we know not, beſides your, *Sic volo, ſic jubeo.* And I wonder alſo we muſt have in your *Government of the Tongue*, *Inveihing* for *inveighing*; unleſs your alteration leans more to the Latine: And for the ſame reaſon ſurely, you print, *exemt* for *exempt*; and *preſumtion* for *preſumption*; and *redemtion* for *redemption*; do you not? No ſurely: here the Latine Orthographie is not good enough, but you fear you ſhould make Ladies mouths ſtand awry, if they ſhould

pro-

pronounce true Engliſh. And with greater confidence yet, you deſert the Latine, in writing *Supercede* for *Superſede*. But perhaps you firſt faild in the Latine Tongue, concerning that word, to be there, *Supercedo*, and not *Superſedeo*, by which preſumptuous acts of yours, the true Etymologie of words may ſoon ſuffer much: as it hath in the very name *Oxford*, which is moſt generally ſuppoſed to take its derivation and denomination from an Ox and a Ford; but falſely: though the very Armes of that Place would prove ſo much; and a more modern writing of that name, by interpoſing one ſyllable in the middle, would ſtrengthen the vulgar errour; for the greater glory of it; as *Oxenford:* that ſo, as they ſay, that aſcribe much to the power of numbers, *Achilles* overcame *Hector* (otherwiſe as good a man as he) becauſe *Achilles* his name conſiſted of three ſyllables, and *Hectors*, but of two; ſo *Oxford*, becoming *Oxenford*, with three ſyllables, ſhould ſo far overpower *Cambridge*, that of a Famous Univerſity, it ſhould become a Countrie School. But the *Rebus* or Hieroglyphick ſeems quite to be ſpoild, by the more true Etymologie given us by Mr. *William Slater*, an ingenious Antiquarie, in his Marginal note, on his *Votum*, before his *Palæ-albion*, thus writing *Ousford, the true interpretation of Oxford; ſo called of the river Ouſe running by it.* So that whoever will have an Ox for the Armes of *Oxford*, muſt rather fetch it from the famous Univerſity of *Athens*, to which it anciently belonged: but that falling into decay, the Beaſt left that place, (and travailing I know not which way) till it came to *Calice*, did wade or ford over to *Dover*, and from thence paſſed ſtrait to *Ousford* and made it *Oxford*, afterward *Oxenford*; the ſame year that the Virgin *Maryes* houſe was carried from Ieruſalem to *Loretto:* making it the famouſeſt Univerſity in *Europe*, where I leave it.

I come next to ſhew how you have injuriouſly and ſhamefully *docked* Engliſh words, by taking from the latter end of them. And here firſt, whereas it was moſt uſual to leave the vowel *e* at the end of a word, as *Quieſcent*, according to many ancient and modern Languages, but eſpecially for the great uſe, informing and declining words, beſides the foreſaid Euphonie; now a dayes, with leſſe judgment than boldneſs, that muſt be removed. Firſt all our Subſtantives ending in double *ſs*, never wanting *e* after them, muſt now ſtand without: becauſe (ſorſooth) pronunciation is ſecure without it: And therefore now *bleſſedneſs*, and *wickedneſs*, and *gueſs* and *bleſs* muſt want *e* which they had formerly, and upon much better reaſon than it is denied them now: And ſo the verbs *love*, *have*, *live*, and ſuch like, muſt content themſelves with three letters now as *lov*, *hav*, *liv*, to the overthrow of that general rule in forming our Engliſh verbes, whoſe *Tenſes* and *Perſons* were generally carried on with the addition of *s* or *th*, or *ſt*, or *d* only joyned to the Firſt perſon Singular: as *I love*, *I have*, *I knowe*, *I live*, beget the ſecond perſon *thou loveſt*, *thou haveſt* or contractedly, *haſt*; *thou knoweſt*, and *thou liveſt*. And ſo the third perſon; *He loveth*, *he liveth*, *he knoweth:* And ſo in the Preterimperfect Tenſe, *I loved*, *I lived*, *I Followed*, *thou loveſt* and *know* being here Anomalous. Thus may a man obſerve, that moſt Engliſh words are formed by the addition of the ſaid two letters, and ſometimes, three to the original verb: but now upon this new device, we muſt be conſtrained to make an *e* on purpoſe to diverſifie our perſons: which alſo muſt be done in nowns ſubſtantive, when we would of *ſingular*, make them *plural*. Formerly, and more compendiouſly and ſimply, we made all Plurals by onely *s* added: as *bonds*, *words*, *lights*, &c. and therefore ever after a double *ſs* in the laſt ſyllable, was added an *e* ſtanding, not (as many imagined) altogether uſeleſs; but in readineſs to receive another *s* when there was an occaſion to uſe the plural number: as *wickedneſse*, made the plural, *wickedneſſes:* and *Exceſſe*, *Exceſſes*, and *diſtreſſe*, *diſtreſſes*. But if a man ſhall write in the ſingular, *wickedneſs* and *exceſs* and *diſtreſs*; he cannot make of them the plural number, by adding ano-

ther *s*, but must be forced to take a whole syllable so to do, contrary to the common grounds of our English Tongue, against which yet, it seems somewhat of the latest to speak, fashion having so far prevailed ever since, and scarce before the late Rebellion, under *Charles* the first, when some men struck at the ancient established Lawes of Church and State, others busying themselves in murthering or mutulating English words, which they also called *Reformation*. I do remember in the Rebellious times to have met with a Parliamentarie Primer, which would take off the unnecessarie ceremonies from words; and taught Children to read and write *trubl*, and *battl*, and *duble*, for *trouble*, and *battle*, or *battel*, and *double* very learnedly; and a fit precedent for *Oxford* Presse to follow.

And what should I here mention the innumerable insolences of that Presse in leaving out *e* the termination of words, as in *Calm*, *Som*, *Sarcasm*, *Press*, with which the foresaid books abound. I adde to these sort of changes, another absurdity, in taking away consonants too; as for example, writing there *Diabolic*, *Topic*, *Stomac*, *Dublick*, in stead of the known words *Diabolick*, *Topick*, *publick*: or, as sometimes they were written *Diabolique*, *Topique*, *Publique*: but never, but from *Oxford* with a *c* terminating them: unless from *France*, where I find them so spelt; but what have we to do to conforme our English to their Language? And yet I suppose as one of Fashion, rather than substance, followed them, when you also wrot, *vertu* and *valu*, for *vertue* and *value*, as the English Tongue requires.

But being almost as much tired in writing, as I may suppose you may be in reading this, I shall only mention your Masterpiec of refining or reforming our Language, in constant writing *Tho* for *though*, and *thro* for through in The Government of the Tongue thus, printing the words Psalm 139. v. 9 *Their Tongues go thro the world*; which if it doth appear to be done with any good judgment and reason, besides your old *Sic volo Sic jubeo*, I am content to set down under the severe censure of a troublesome quarreller: but if not, I hope you will please (to prevent a Schisme in our Language) to return to true Orthographie. I cannot imagine what put you upon such a faileur, besides a vain designe of softning our Language, and so to confound the rules of spelling, that the weake and ignorant may justifie their involuntarie slips from such voluntarie errours as you commit: or from a more generall ground whereby now of late dayes, Libertie of writing is become as reasonable, as libertie of beleiving and worship: And so there should remain no such thing as true and false spelling in the English Tongue. Or perhaps you considering that the vowel and two letters *g*, *h*, which you rob the foresaid words of partaking of the nature of aspirations, you thought it advisable, to spare us our breath, the better to cool our porrage; as I may so write, in imitation of you, teaching us to regulate our Pens by our Tongues.

But I might argue first against your *tho*, and *thro*, because being but parts, of words, they can signify nothing at all, standing by themselves: as the very first page almost, of some Logicks tell us, so that the syllables in *domus*, being seperated, signifie just nothing: though both *do* and *must*, as entire words, doe. But what ever you may ordain that relique of a word for, you can give us no reason why it should retain the same force in pronunciation, as when it enjoyed all its letters. For in our Language, Initial letters do varie their value according to their terminations. For instance, *Tho* in *though*, is not to be pronounced as *Tho* in *Thought*. For it is manifest to any ordinarie observer of the English speech, that *th* hath a double force, ever since we lost the use of the Saxon ð, of which you may read so much spoken by Mr. *Gill* in his *Logonomia*, and Mr. *Butler* in his *English Grammar*. For there remains still so great affinity between the Saxon, or Teutonick (as *Verstegan* pleases to call our Language) ð, and our *th*, that we sometimes write some words with the one, and

sometimes

ſometimes with the other, without any exception: as *murther* or *murder:* and I know ſome countries in England, where the common people wer wont to ſay *It is very thark* or *ðark*, inſtead of *dark;* which I once took to be a greater corruption than in truth it is: therefore you writing only *Tho*, we cannot tell, whether we ſhould pronounce it as *o*, or as *tho*, in *thought* and *thorow*, untill we have taken our horſes and rod to the Oxonian Oracle. For if you ſhould (and upon your own grounds you ought to) write, *thi* for *thigh*, we could not tell whether we ſhould pronounce it as *thie*, or as *thigh*, without recourſe had to the ſaid Oracle. But it ſhould ſeem, the authour of this rare and civillzed way of writing never conſiderd the force of *ugh* cut off by him; which is not ſo aſpirate as he might imagine for ſome countries (and that adjacent to Oxford ſhire) pronounce *though*, as we generally do *cough* and *rough*, and *laugh* and *enough*, as if they were written *Thoff*, *coff ruff*, *enuff*. Now would I fain know, whether your *Tho* come, or ought to be ſo pronounced: And if ſo, why we may not write *Co*, and *Ra* and *La*, for all that belongs to them. I muſt ingenuouſly confeſs; I being but a ſimple *Davus*, and no *Oedipus*, cannot underſtand, nor unriddle this; and you being but an *Editor* and not *Cadmus* i.e. a Maſter of Letters or maker of Languages, I am not bound to believ you, though you ſhould tell me your meaning. But there remains one reaſon more againſt *tho* for *though*, which I hope you will believe to be valid, when your ſenſes ſhall convince you: and that is, that in our ancienter Engliſh Tongue, *tho* ſignifies quite another thing from what you intend it: as may appear from *Chauncer*; who uſes it two wayes, But neither of them in your ſenſe. For with him it ſignifies *Then*, and not *Though*; as in thoſe verſes quoted out of him, by his Publiſhers, (I ſhould have ſaid *Editors*) before his works, which are theſe.

I know that in fourm of ſpeech is change
Within an hundreth yeers; and words tho
That hadden price, now wonder, nice and ſtrange
Think we them; and yet they ſpeak them ſo;
And ſped as well in love as men now do

Theſe Verſes are made in commendation of the Engliſh Language, even before *Chaucer*: and therefore his offence againſt our auncient Tongue, leſſe excuſable; that, contrary to his own judgment, he ſhould endeavour to improve and imbelliſh it, by a number of Latine and French words brought into it, to the loſs of as many, and as ſignificant Teutonique words, and to the corruption of our Mother tongue; as *Verſtegan* hath obſerved, and proved againſt *Chaucer*. Yet is this brave Authour more excuſable than many of this age, as uſing that liberty of innovating chiefly in Poetry, where it was evermore allowed, than in Proſe, wherein he is much more ſparing of forrein words. In *The Romant of the Roſe*, being a tranſlation of the French Authour *Clopinel* or *Meung*, he about the beginning, uſes *tho* for *then:* and in his *Teſtament in Love*, fol: 301 of his Workes, ſometimes he uſes it for *then*, and ſometimes for *thoſe:* as: *I have (qd I tho) y nough:* for *quoth I then*: And preſently after, he thus uniteth, *I would now (qd I) a little underſtand ſi then all things thus before en not, whether thilking be of tho things.* i.e. of *thoſe things*. Thus he: but you, for *tho*, or *thoſe*, pleaſe to write *thos*, keeping neither to old, nor modern Orthographie, but walking by your ſelf, to the prejudice of the uſual pronunciation, which is thereby altered. This you doe in the Preface to *The Government of the Tongue*. And with the like liberty, in *The Ladies Calling*, you write *leſt* for *leaſt*: as if you underſtood not the difference between the adverb leſt, and the adjective *leaſt*.

But there I end my defence of our Orthographie offended by you; wherein

if

if I have erred, I hope I ſhall be better informed ere long from an Oxford Printer, which we may hope to ſee ſuddenly publiſhed there, according to the beſt Copies there only to be found, eſpecially if Subſcriptions come in plentifully, anſwerable to ſo weighty a work: that ſo, as according to you, Cambridg is but a Countrie School, Oxford may become a Schooldame, to teach us to ſpell, though in that Art ſhe hath been very unfortunate hitherto.

And thus Sir, end I my weak Advice conceived and declared not ſo much in oppoſition to you, as vindication of our ancient birthrights; in which you have committed ſo many Raſures already, and by the ſame reaſon may proceed to more and greater alterations, till ſome retaining *their old Mumpſimus*, and others following your New *Sumpſimus* of writing, a Babel of confuſion firſt, and then of diviſion be introduced, which may reduce us to another Heptarchie of ſpeaking; others being encouraged by you, to be reforming our Tongue, as well as you: ſo that in proceſs of time, we, now united, may relapſe into that unhappineſs of men, which irrationall creatures are not ſubject too. Who, in all Parts of the earth, underſtand thoſe of their own kinde; as a Lyon, horſe, dogge and hog of Europe or Aſia underſtand their fellowes in Affrica and America, when ever caſually they meet, as well as if they had been alwaies bred together: which mankinde cannot do, no not after the Famous Univerſal Character publiſhed for their inſtruction. But all this notwithſtanding, when the Legiſlative power of Language be but halfe ſo well Proved, as it is ill aſſumed by you, you ſhall finde me (to prevent contention) to be not only one of your trueſt Friends, but beſt Subjects.

FINIS.